

hand we're sending messages to Washington, people to Washington and everybody is saying we're in such dire straits and we turn right around and contradict ourselves and then try to pass a bill like this. I don't think it is right and I think it can wait a year. There is nothing wrong in waiting a year so, therefore, I support the bracket motion and we'll see what happens to that before we come to the next one. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Warner, did you wish to speak further? All right.

SENATOR WARNER: Well again, Mr. President, as I've indicated, that I am not going to ask for a motion to advance the bill today on the same basis that we have not advanced other bills that had a general fund impact. But what I had hoped to do is to resolve the issue as to whatever form the bill is going to be in or indefinitely postponed if that's the body's will. But then when it is in its form, then I will have an A bill drafted that reflects the provisions and then when the motion that Senator DeCamp filed the other day as to when, under the rules, A bills can be taken up and the Rules Committee has heard that or devised whatever adjustment that might be made, then LB 43 as well as the other...I think it's three other bills that are on General File with a general fund impact that we've considered to date, then this can be advanced at the same as the others or not advanced. If it is going to be held I would rather see it held on Final Reading when it got over there, but again this is not an unusual process that we're doing here. The last time we had the adjustment the bill was introduced in '81 and was killed in '82. The hard political facts are that salary adjustment bills are more likely to be killed in even numbered years than odd numbered years and that is self-evident. But I think that I would urge you not to bracket the bill, treat it like any of the other bills that have a fiscal impact and we have many of them. But again, as I indicated, it will be held. One other thing I will repeat one more time, the Constitution is what locks you in for four years, for five years, actually doesn't take effect so it is four years. We've been locked in for eight. You decide if you want to lock it in for four more for a total of twelve and that's just how it is. The Constitution is what it is. If you feel that the adjustments are too high, why, offer motions to reduce them and we can discuss it, but I would think it would be to